



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/530,283

04/04/2005

Toshiaki Sasaki

81845.0019

4670

26021 7590 11/07/2008  
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.  
1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS  
SUITE 1400  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

EXAMINER

BERDICHEVSKY, MIRIAM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/07/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/530,283	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SASAKI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MIRIAM BERDICHEVSKY	<b>Art Unit</b> 1795	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1, 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe (US 4776894 as cited in the IDS) in view of Yamagishi (US 4926230).

As to claim 1, Watanabe teaches a stacked layer type photoelectric conversion device comprising:

- A plurality of conversion units stacked (column 3, lines 60-65) on a substrate (column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 1), each of which includes one conductivity type layer, a photoelectric conversion layer of

Art Unit: 1795

substantially intrinsic semiconductor and an opposite conductivity type layer in this order from a light incident side (column 4, lines 17-29),

- At least one of the opposite conductivity type layer in a front photoelectric conversion unit arranged relatively closer to the light incident side and the one conductivity type layer in a back photoelectric conversion unit arranged adjacent to the front photoelectric conversion (column 4, lines 29-32) unit includes a silicon composite layer at least in a part thereof (layers 33 and 42, column 4, lines 29-32), and
- The silicon composite layer has an oxygen concentration (column 4, lines 36-48; Examiner notes that a-SiO<sub>x</sub> is desirable for increasing bandwidth) of more than 25 atomic % and less than 60 atomic % (column 8, lines 36-39) and includes silicon rich phase parts in an amorphous (column 4, lines 36-48) alloy phase of silicon and oxygen.

Watanabe is silent to the composite layer thickness being more than 20 nm and less than 130 nm.

Yamagishi teaches a thickness in the range of 7 nm to 70 nm depending on the dopant concentration to optimize absorption loss (column 2, lines 19-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a layer having a thickness that falls within the claimed range would increase the active regions of the cells and that the thickness range is dependent on the dopant concentration, as taught by Yamagishi (column 2, lines 19-41).

Art Unit: 1795

Regarding claim 3, Watanabe teaches that the silicon rich phase part includes doped amorphous silicon (column 4, lines 36-48).

Regarding claim 8, Watanabe teaches that an optical energy gap of the silicon composite layer is at least 2.2 eV (column 5, lines 55-59). Moreover, a wider bandgap is desirable for improving efficiency by decreasing the absorption of light, as taught by Watanabe (column 1, lines 50-67).

4. Claims 2 and 4-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe and Yamagishi as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Nakamura (JP 59035016).

Applicant is directed to the above paragraphs for a complete discussion of Watanabe and Yamagishi as applied to claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Watanabe is silent to that the silicon rich phase part includes a silicon crystal phase.

Nakamura teaches that the silicon rich phase part includes a silicon crystal phase (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the amorphous and crystalline silicon of Nakamura in the composite layer of Watanabe because the solar cell will have the merits of both phases, as taught by Nakamura (abstract). Amorphous silicon has the advantage that it can easily be deposited over large areas while the advantage of crystalline silicon is the increased stability against light exposure.

Art Unit: 1795

Regarding claim 4, the silicon composite layer with a thickness of greater than 20 nm but less than 130 nm, a oxygen composition of more than 25 atomic % but less than 60 atomic % and both amorphous and crystalline phases, resulting from the modification of Watanabe with Yamagishi and Nakamura according to claims 1 and 2, see paragraphs above, will inherently have an reflective index regarding light of 600 nm wavelength is more than 1.7 and less than 2.5.

Regarding claim 5, Watanabe teaches that the substrate is transparent (column 3, lines 60-64). In addition, the silicon composite layer with a thickness of greater than 20 nm but less than 130 nm, a oxygen composition of more than 25 atomic % but less than 60 atomic % and both amorphous and crystalline phases, resulting from the modification of Watanabe with Yamagishi and Nakamura according to claims 1 and 2, see paragraphs above, will inherently have a reflection spectrum of at least one maximal value and at least one minimal value of reflectance in a wavelength range of 500 nm to 800 nm and a difference between the maximal value and the minimal value is at least 1 % because there are no structural differences between the modified device of Watanabe and that of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 6, the silicon composite layer with a thickness of greater than 20 nm but less than 130 nm, a oxygen composition of more than 25 atomic % but less than 60 atomic % and both amorphous and crystalline phases, resulting from the modification of Watanabe with Yamagishi and Nakamura according to claims 1 and 2, see paragraphs above, will inherently have a dark conductivity of more than  $10^{-8}$  S/cm

Art Unit: 1795

and less than  $10^{-1}$  S/cm because there are no structural differences between the modified device of Watanabe and that of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 7, the silicon composite layer with a thickness of greater than 20 nm but less than 130 nm, a oxygen composition of more than 25 atomic % but less than 60 atomic % and both amorphous and crystalline phases, resulting from the modification of Watanabe with Yamagishi and Nakamura according to claims 1 and 2, see paragraphs above, will inherently have an intensity ratio of TO mode peak from the crystalline parts to a TO mode peak from the amorphous parts measure by Raman scattering more than 0.5 and less than 10 because there are no structural differences between the modified device of Watanabe and that of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 9, the silicon composite layer with a thickness of greater than 20 nm but less than 130 nm, a oxygen composition of more than 25 atomic % but less than 60 atomic % and both amorphous and crystalline phases, resulting from the modification of Watanabe with Yamagishi and Nakamura according to claims 1 and 2, see paragraphs above, will inherently have an energy difference between upper most energy of a photoelectron having suffered interband excitation loss of O1s and peak energy of the O1s photoelectron measured by XPS is at least 2.2 eV because there are no structural differences between the modified device of Watanabe and that of the claimed invention.

5. Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe and Yamagishi as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Yoshida (US 4875944).

Art Unit: 1795

Applicant is directed to the above paragraphs for a complete discussion of Watanabe and Yamagishi as applied to claim 1.

Regarding claim 10, Watanabe and Yamagishi are silent to a dopant concentration in the silicon composite layer is in a range from  $3 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  to  $1.8 \times 10^{21} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ .

Yoshida teaches a dopant concentration in the silicon composite layer is in a range from  $3 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  to  $1.8 \times 10^{21} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  (column 3, lines 7-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the dopant concentration of Yoshida in the composite layer of Watanabe because the conversion efficiency remains high for a long period of time, as taught by Yoshida (column 3, lines 7-18).

6. Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe and Yamagishi as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Kondo (JP 2002-170973, see machine translation).

Applicant is directed to the above paragraphs for a complete discussion of Watanabe and Yamagishi as applied to claim 1.

Regarding claims 11-12, Watanabe and Yamagishi are silent to the substrate having the silicon composite layer deposited to a part of its total thickness in a plasma CVD reaction chamber is temporarily taken out to expose a surface of the silicon composite layer to the ambient air and then after the substrate is introduced again into a plasma CVD reaction chamber the remaining part of the total thickness of the silicon composite layer is deposited.



Art Unit: 1795

Further regarding claim 12, Watanabe and Yamagishi are silent to taking the substrate out from the plasma CVD reaction chamber to the ambient air after at least 60% of the total thickness of the silicon composite layer is deposited.

Kondo teaches having the silicon composite layer deposited to a part of its total thickness in a plasma CVD reaction (¶ [0008]) chamber is temporarily taken out to expose a surface of the silicon composite layer to the ambient air and then after the substrate is introduced again into a plasma CVD reaction chamber the remaining part of the total thickness of the silicon composite layer is deposited and that the substrate is taken out from the plasma CVD reaction chamber to the ambient air after at least 60% (¶ [0008], [0009], [0010], and [0012], where exposure at the end is greater than 60%) of the total thickness of the silicon composite layer is deposited.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to use the expose technique of Kondo in the module preparation of Watanabe because the technique is low in cost and improves the module's stability and resistance to the environment, as taught by Kondo (¶ s [0003] and [0007]). Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use taking the product out of the CVD as a means for exposing the product to atmosphere (ambient) oxygen and then putting it back in to continue CVD of the following layers.

Regarding claim 13, Watanabe teaches a mixing ratio of doping source gas to silicon source gas for deposition of the silicon composite layer in a plasma CVD reaction chamber is in a range from 0.012 to 0.07 (Table 3, layer 33,  $\text{PH}_3/\text{SiH}_4$ ).

Art Unit: 1795

7. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (EP 1198014) in view of Watanabe and further in view of Yamagishi.

As to claim 14, Hayashi teaches an integrated type photoelectric conversion device comprising:

- A first electrode layer (3),
- A plurality of conversion units stacked on a substrate, each of which includes one conductivity type layer (4a), and an opposite conductivity type layer (4b) in this order from a light incident side (Figure 2, ¶ [0026]),
- A second electrode (6) layer successively stacked on a substrate separated by a plurality of isolation grooves (21, 22, 23) to form a plurality of photoelectric conversion cells (figure 2, ¶ [0027]), and
- The cells are electrically connected in series (¶ [0030]) with each other.

Hayashi is silent to:

- A photoelectric conversion layer of substantially intrinsic semiconductor, and
- A plurality of stacked photoelectric conversion units each including:
  - At least one of the opposite conductivity type layer in a front photoelectric conversion unit arranged relatively closer to the light incident side and the one conductivity type layer in a back photoelectric conversion unit arranged adjacent to the front photoelectric conversion unit includes a silicon composite layer at least in a part thereof, and

Art Unit: 1795

- The silicon composite layer has a thickness of more than 20nm and less than 130nm and an oxygen concentration of more than 25 atomic % and less than 60 atomic % and includes silicon rich phase parts in an amorphous alloy phase of silicon and oxygen.

Watanabe teaches:

- A photoelectric conversion layer of substantially intrinsic semiconductor (column 4, lines 17-32), and
- A plurality of stacked photoelectric conversion units each including:
  - At least one of the opposite conductivity type layer in a front photoelectric conversion unit arranged relatively closer to the light incident side and the one conductivity type layer in a back photoelectric conversion unit arranged adjacent to the front photoelectric conversion unit (column 4, lines 17-32), includes a silicon composite layer at least in a part thereof (layers 33 and 42, column 4, lines 29-32), and
- The silicon composite layer has an oxygen concentration (column 4, lines 36-48; Examiner notes that a-SiO<sub>x</sub> is desirable for increasing bandwidth) of more than 25 atomic % and less than 60 atomic % (column 8, lines 36-39) and includes silicon rich phase parts in an amorphous (column 4, lines 36-48) alloy phase of silicon and oxygen.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a layer having a thickness that falls within the claimed range would

Art Unit: 1795

increase the active regions of the cells and that the thickness range is dependent on the dopant concentration, as taught by Yamagishi (column 2, lines 19-41).

Hayashi and Watanabe are silent to the composite layer thickness being more than 20 nm and less than 130 nm.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to increase the composite layer thickness of the composite layer used in Watanabe because this would increase the active regions of the cells. Furthermore, it has been held that discovering the optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in art (MPEP, 2144.05, IIB), especially since Yamagishi teaches a thickness in the range of 7 nm to 70 nm depending on the dopant concentration to optimize absorption loss (column 2, lines 19-41).

Regarding claim 15, Hayashi teaches that the first electrode layer (3) is separated into a plurality of regions corresponding to the plurality of photoelectric conversion cells (10) by a plurality of first isolation grooves (21), the plurality of photoelectric conversion unit layers (4a, 4b) and the second electrode layer (6) are separated into a plurality of regions corresponding to the plurality of cells by a plurality of second isolation grooves (22) and a connection groove (23) is provided between the first isolation groove (21) and the second isolation groove to electrically connect the first electrode of one of the cells with the second electrode of its neighboring cell (Figure 2, ¶s [0026], [0027], [0030]).

***Response to Arguments***

8 Applicant's arguments filed 7/30/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Wantanabe does not teach a separate layer which constitutes the silicon composite layer of the instant claim 1. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, as noted by Applicant other embodiments of Wantanabe teaches that the impurity layer (43) of embodiment 1 can manifest itself as an intermediate layer (63) in a second embodiment (Figure 10).

Applicant argues that because the impurity layer of Wantanabe has a conductivity type it can not be considered the same as that of the instant invention. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Instant claim 1 is not limited to silicon composite layers that do not have a conductivity type.

Applicant argues that Watanabe does not disclose 25-60 atomic % oxygen impurity in the impurity layer/silicon composite layer. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Watanabe teaches that oxygen in addition to the impurities cited by Applicant, nitrogen and carbon, is contained at between 3-30% in the amorphous silicon layers, perhaps more clearly stated in Watanabe's claim 7.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the silicon composite layer is a matrix of an amorphous silicon oxide phase and silicon rich parts dispersed in a matrix) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the

Art Unit: 1795

specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's argument that neither Watanabe no Yamagichi teach that the impurity layer/silicon composite layer obtains reflection, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. Applicant references Page 14, last line through Page 15, 3rd line of the instant specification as well as Figure 11, as a teaching of unexpected results derived from the instant claimed range of thickness, however the Figure and specification alone do not support that the claimed range (20nm – 130nm) results in unexpected performance. Applicant is directed to MPEP 716.02(b) for guidance regarding unexpected results.

Finally, in response to applicant's argument that Yamagishi is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, both the silicon composite layer of the instant application and the layers of Yamagishi are amorphous silicon with an impurity, such as oxygen (col. 1, lines 36-38; col. 2, lines 16-22). Furthermore, both the instant application and Yamagishi are drawn to multijunction solar cells which have an intermediate layer, as taught by Yamagishi (col. 1, lines 31-35 and Figure 1). Yamagishi is relied upon as a

Art Unit: 1795

general teaching showing that an intermediate layer with an impurity of oxygen is commonly made to in the desired range as required by instant claim 1 (col. 2, lines 19-41).

### ***Conclusion***

9 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **MIRIAM BERDICHEVSKY** whose telephone number is (571)270-5256. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 10am-8pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alexa Neckel can be reached on (571) 272-1446. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1795

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. B./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1795

/Alexa D. Neckel/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795